IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Raymond E. SUORSA et al. §	Confirmation No.:		9523
	§			
Serial No.:	09/838,142 §	Group Art Unit:		2152
	§			
Filed:	April 20, 2001 §	Examiner:	Dohm Chankong	
	§			
For:	Automated Provisioning of §	Docket No.:		200704486-1
	Computer Networks Using a §			
	Network Database Data §			
	Model §			

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents   Date: June 10, 2008
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated April 11, 2008, Appellants submit this Reply Brief for further consideration by the Board.

In addition to the reasons provided in the Appeal Brief, claim 32 is not anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,964 ("*Suzuki*") for the following reasons. Claim 32 recites a "gateway" interface between "the queue" and "the agent." In claim 32, the gateway performs various functions such as retrieving commands from the queue, transmitting commands to the agent, receiving messages from the agent and so forth. *Suzuki* does not teach a gateway as in claim 32. For example, regarding the limitation "retrieving, at said gateway, a command from the queue and transmitting the retrieved command from the gateway to an agent running on at least one of said remote devices, for execution on said one device," the Examiner cites col. 8, lines 19-24 of *Suzuki* as teaching this limitation. See Examiner's Answer dated 04/11/08, page 4. However, the cited text does not mention a gateway and simply describes downloading an agent 12 from a server 100 to a client 200. Further, the operation described in *Suzuki* is installing an agent rather than sending a command to an agent that is already running as in claim 32.

As another example, regarding the limitation "at said gateway, receiving a message from the agent reporting the results of the execution of the command," the Examiner cites col. 8, lines 25-28 of *Suzuki* as teaching this limitation. See Examiner's Answer dated 04/11/08, page 4. However, the cited text simply describes the agent 12 accessing a managing record file 10 in the server 100. Instead of teaching a gateway as in claim 32, *Suzuki's* agent 12 appears to have direct access to the files (*e.g.,* file 10) of the server 100. Further, the cited text states that the agent 12 does not record anything about the install execution state of the client 200. Thus, in *Suzuki*, there is no message from an agent reporting the results of executing a command as in claim 32.

As another example, regarding the limitation "retrieving, at said gateway, the next command from the queue in response to receipt of said message, and transmitting said retrieved next command to the agent for execution," the Examiner cites col. 8, lines 28-37 of *Suzuki* as teaching this limitation. See Examiner's Answer dated 04/11/08, page 4. Again, the cited text fails to mention a gateway and instead describes the agent 12 accessing and executing commands to install an operating system. In *Suzuki*, the agent 12 appears to operate independently of a gateway and does not wait to receive a next command from a gateway as does Appellants' agent in claim 32.

As another example, regarding the limitation "retrieving at the gateway a message from the agent indicating the completion of the reboot process at the remote device," the Examiner cites col. 8, lines 46-49 of *Suzuki* as teaching this limitation. See Examiner's Answer dated 04/11/08, page 5. Again, the cited text fails to mention a gateway and simply mentions a reboot is executed in the client 200. After rebooting the client 200, S*uzuki's* agent 12 is downloaded again and begins to access the file 10 and to execute commands without providing messages to a gateway regarding the reboot process as in claim 32. Based on the foregoing, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 32 and its dependent claims be reversed and the claims be issued.

For the reasons stated above as well as in Appellants' principle brief, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner erred in rejecting all pending

claims. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan D. Christenson/
Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400